

Chairman BOUCHER circulated was hijacked. I am not sure what happened to it, but it just kind of disappeared.

We had six committee prints that were marked up at subcommittee and full committee. They were artfully crafted in such a way that no amendment that dealt with energy was germane to the committee prints. As I said at the full committee markup, I am in awe of the parliamentary expertise, but I was not in awe of the substance of the actual amendments or the actual committee prints.

This is the first Congress that I have served in in which there has not been a bipartisan approach to energy policy. In all the previous Congresses that I have served in, whether you had a Democrat majority or a Republican majority, when it came to energy policy, we tried to be bipartisan. For some reason, so far in this Congress that has not been the case.

If you look at the complete text of the bill that is before us, you see things in it that have never been seen before in an energy bill.

□ 1200

There is some sort of a Clean Energy Foundation that is appropriated \$100 million that apparently has the authority to enter into contracts, perhaps even binding contracts, with foreign governments. That is not from the Energy and Commerce part of the bill, but it is in one of the titles in the bill.

We don't have anything on clean coal technology. We don't have anything on oil and gas. There is in the Energy and Commerce section of the bill, there is something to try to clarify the loan guarantees with regard to new construction of nuclear power plants which was considered in the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

There are some sections of the bill that deal with building codes, and one could argue that section of the bill preempts State and local building codes. I'm not sure that is the kind of energy policy that we really want to implement, where Washington knows better than your local government what the building codes should be.

There is a provision that says "by date certain". I think the date certain is 2050, that every building in America has to, on a net basis, consume no energy. There are some exclusions based on reasonableness, but there is no exclusion based on cost, including the building that we are currently in, the Capitol of the United States of America.

Can you imagine what it is going to cost if this bill becomes law to make the U.S. Capitol on a net basis use no energy? I am not sure it could even be done, but if it can be done, it is going to be enormously expensive.

For some of the reasons I have already outlined, the administration has said they are going to veto the bill. So this is really an exercise in sterile futility because this bill isn't going anywhere. I am not even sure it will be at-

tempted to be conferenced with the other body.

This is not the way I conducted energy policy when I was chairman of the Energy Committee. I believe it is probably not the way that the current chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee really wants to conduct energy policy. This is really a political exercise to give some Members of the majority party a forum to put forward their pet ideas and pet projects. But it is not good for the country, and it is not good energy policy, and it should be defeated in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. reliance on unstable foreign sources of oil is at an all-time high. The world price of oil set a record just this week. Refinery capacity is shaky and shrinking fast, and I remind everyone here for the umpteenth time that no new refinery has been built in America in more than 30 years.

Americans want to know when we will start producing more of our own energy at prices that real people can afford to pay. I want to know how much ordinary Americans have to endure before the Democratic majority takes any action that actually matters on cutting fuel costs to working people?

Take natural gas. It used to be cheap, but now it's expensive and we burn too much of it for the purpose of generating electricity. That's a big part of the reason that it costs so much to heat and cool a home, but people also pay extra in the products and services they buy because pricy electricity drives up manufacturing cost. Sometimes it even drives industry and jobs out of the country.

Coal is our Nation's most abundant energy source, but the Democratic leadership doesn't see it that way. They are mostly interested in astonishingly costly and barely viable energy sources rather than the cheapest and most abundant, and it will be ordinary working Americans who will pay the cost of their policies. Don't get me wrong. Windmills and solar arrays are worthy of our support, but so is the cheapest and most abundant fuel we have. Yet coal, whether it's clean or liquefied or both, is just not on the Democratic majority's political agenda at any cost.

Even the energy efficiency parts of the Democratic bill are more sticks than carrots. For example, nearly everybody thought it would best if air conditioners and furnaces were built to match specific regions' particular energy needs. Who hasn't noticed that the summers in Texas are a little different than the summers in Maine? I'm here to tell you that the winters are different, too.

Most of us thought that buyers should get to decide on the heating and cooling equipment that works best for them. But instead of giving consumers information and choices, we're going to punish retailers who have the gall to let their customers decide what they need and want. In the view of the Democratic majority, Washington knows what's best.

In 2007, our America faces energy challenges on every front, but on this sorry day, we're not going to do anything about them. We are engaged here today in what is laughingly called a debate about an energy bill. This is hardly a debate, and this is certainly not an energy bill.

I hope we can stop this nonsense and start over and get it right. I urge my colleagues to

take every opportunity today to achieve that noble goal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time of the Science and Technology Committee and presume in all this finagling I haven't lost my 7½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7½ minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have said it here before and I will keep on saying it. For some reason, there is a war going on today against energy from fossil fuels, and I am not really sure why. Anyone ought to be able to understand that, to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil and to increase our national security, we need conventional, renewable, and alternative sources of energy. Our country at this time will not be able to continue to thrive and lead the world on renewable energy alone. Punishing the oil and gas industry, hindering alternative uses of clean coal and stifling nuclear power will ensure that the United States loses its place as a world leader.

Make no mistake, I support the continued development and increased use of renewable energy but not at the detriment of fossil fuels and clean nuclear energy that we absolutely have to have today.

The bill before us today includes many provisions of research and development into renewable energies that I support, but there is not one thing in this bill that would encourage the development or production of oil and gas in our country or off our country's coast, which is the only way we are going to decrease our imports in the near term.

Why? What on earth are my friends on the other side of the aisle afraid of? I can't for the life of me understand the pure venom that is felt for the oil and gas industry.

At this time in our country's history, more than any other time, when we are up against terrorists who have no fear of dying and only want to kill as many Americans as they can, we need to develop our domestic sources of energy for ourselves. We need to reduce our imports and our dependence on OPEC. And, yes, we need to continue developing renewable and alternative sources of energy to eventually help displace our use of oil and gas. But it is not going to happen next year or in the next 10 years. We need to be realistic about this and deliberate about this and come together about this because I believe Republicans and Democrats alike care about our youngsters and care about the future of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that this bill has energy independence and national security in its title. I think it is misleading. We can't become independent and secure on energy